

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTFCG) was held on October 15, 2003. The following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton OCA (240) 777-3724
Bill Landfair M-NCPPC (301) 495-4588
Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609
Melanie Coffin OMB (240) 777-2763
Helen Xu DTS (240) 777-2804
David Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252
Steve Batterden DPW&T (240) 777-6063

STAFF

Margie Williams OCA (240) 777-3762
Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700
Kamal Johari CTC (410) 964-5700

OTHER ATTENDEES

Bill O'Brien T-Mobile
Steven Weber T-Mobile
M.G. Diamond for Verizon Wireless
Jim Michal for Sprint PCS
Henri Komlan Edoh Sprint PCS
Erik Hamilton-Jones Sprint PCS
Carlton Gilbert M-NCPPC

Discussion Item – Meeting Minutes: There were no minutes from the TTFCG action items as there was no meeting and the voting was conducted via e-mail. All items on the consent agenda for that meeting were recommended.

Consent Agenda:

1. Verizon Wireless application to replace 9 existing 52" panel antennas with 9 new 48" dual band antennas at the same location and 122' elevation on a 129' lattice tower located at 12419 Middlebrook Road in Germantown (Application #200305-08).
2. T-Mobile application to flush mount 9 panel antennas on the roof at the 108' level of the NOAA building located at 6100 Executive Boulevard in Rockville (Application #200309-01).
3. T-Mobile application to replace 5 existing 54" pole-mounted antennas with 6 new 54" antennas to be mounted at the 177' level on the roof walls of the Park Ritchie Apartment building located at 7600 Maple Avenue in Takoma Park (Application #200309-02).
4. T-Mobile application to install 9 panel antennas at the 138' level of an existing 150' monopole on the Sarem Farm property located at 15901 Columbia Pike in Burtonsville (Application #200310-01).
5. T-Mobile application to install 3 panel antennas inside the pole at the 90' level of a 100' monopole on the Wesley Grove Church property located at 23612 Woodfield Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200310-02).

Motion: Dave Niblock moved that all consent agenda applications be recommended. Bill Landfair seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: T-Mobile application to attach 9 panel antennas at the 100' level of an existing 250' lattice tower on the Easterday property located at 9265 Brown Church Road in Mt. Airy (Application #200310-03).

Kamal Johari summarized the application. He noted that because of structural changes necessary to support the antennas of the last carrier to attach to this tower, this recommendation was conditioned on T-Mobile providing a structural analysis to the Department of Permitting Services and providing a copy of the report to the Tower Coordinator.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved the application be recommended. Helen Xu seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to construct a new 153' monopole disguised as a flagpole, and flush mount 3 panel antennas at the 148' level and a GPS antenna at the 75' level. The monopole will be placed on the Good Hope Gardens property located at 14911 Good Hope Road in Silver Spring (Application #200308-01).

Kamal Johari summarized the application and noted that in 2001, AT&T Wireless had proposed to construct a monopole just 300 yards from this site, but due to the controversial nature of that siting they withdrew their application in July, 2001.

Mr. Johari reported that there was a minaret at the Mosque at Briggs Chaney and Good Hope Road that could perhaps support Sprint's antennas, but he did not believe it was high enough to meet Sprint's coverage objectives for the area. He also noted that, according to Sprint, the Mosque management was not receptive to requests to attach antennas to the minaret.

Mr. Johari stated he had asked for RF maps at 120' to determine if a shorter monopole would suffice. He stated that although the carrier claimed there was significantly worse coverage with antennas at 120' compared to the proposed 153', it did not appear that there was enough difference to warrant the higher elevation of the antennas. He added that based on the site visit, most of the areas where the RF map showed slightly poorer coverage at 120' were heavily wooded areas or low-lying stream valleys which were also not covered well by the antennas at the 153' level.

Bill Landfair asked if the traditional monopole design would be considered if the elevation was reduced to 120 feet. Jim Michal replied that Sprint has been before the Board of Appeals with several flagpole-design monopoles, and all but one have been received without objection from the community. He stated that in one case, a Darnestown resident objected to lighting the flag at night, but Sprint agreed to a trial period for the light, and if there were any complaints regarding the light, Sprint would discontinue lighting the flag.

Mr. Michal added that for three other sites that had come before the Board of Appeals, there had been no community opposition to the flagpole-design monopole, including the Wesley Grove Methodist Church site, which is the site closest in proximity to nearby homes. He stated that at a Sprint site in the Norbeck area, a neighbor to the monopole site property said he wanted to subdivide his property and the nighttime light on the flagpole might be an issue for the sale of his land. To address that concern, Sprint agreed not to fly the flag. He also advised the group that a flagpole-design site in Virginia was also very well received.

Mr. Michal noted that the only drawback to the flagpole design is that other carriers may not want to use those facilities for co-location because of coverage limitations due to the limit of three antennas per carrier and the concealment of the antennas with RF-friendly material, which also diminishes the coverage.

Mr. Michal stated that he agreed with Mr. Johari that the minaret would probably be too short to serve Sprint's purpose, but added that they may reconsider that location if needed, because although the minaret is short, the site is on higher ground than the Good Hope Gardens property. He also remarked that there were terrain problems in the area due to the number of low valleys. He stated that Sprint asked for a 153' monopole because they believe the coverage is sufficiently improved over lower elevations to warrant that height and that the extra height would make it more attractive for co-location. He said he thought that if Sprint had proposed to use the site AT&T had proposed, they could have used a shorter monopole because that site is on higher ground than the Good Hope Gardens. He noted that even though AT&T withdrew its application due to

community opposition, the AT&T representative had mentioned that AT&T might be interested in co-locating at the Sprint facility. He said T-Mobile had also expressed interest in co-locating on this Sprint site.

Jane Lawton asked if Sprint had considered a tree stealth design. Mr. Michal replied that they thought that a 153' tree would be too large for the site and not be as well received as the flagpole design. In reply to a question from Ms. Lawton regarding tree height, he stated that the trees around the site were approximately 40' to 60' tall.

Ms. Lawton asked if co-location would be problematic at 120 feet. Kamal Johari stated that Sprint's coverage needs appeared to be met with a 120' monopole.

Bob Hunnicutt replied that in considering the 120' height he knew that there were already a number of other Sprint flagpole-design monopoles that were at 120' or less and that those facilities had successfully attracted co-locators. He added that based on his review of the annual site plans by the carriers, none listed any other sitings for the area around the intersection of Good Hope and Briggs Chaney Roads, including AT&T Wireless. Jane Lawton asked the Sprint representatives if they could build the monopole at 120', with the ability to extend it to 153' in the future as demand may warrant. Jim Michal replied that the facility could physically accommodate additional carriers if it were built at 120', but if other carriers wanted to co-locate at higher elevations and the monopole was extended, Sprint would want to be at the highest elevation, still making co-location available only at lower elevations.

Pat Hanehan stated that he believed there would be little difference in the visual impact of a 120' monopole from that of a 153' monopole.

Jane Lawton asked if the Tower Coordinator had received any contact from the public regarding this application. Bob Hunnicutt said he had not received any calls about this proposed siting, and that he had only spoken with the property owner.

Dave Niblock asked Sprint if they had filed for the Special Exception and if a Special Exception sign had been posted at the site alerting residents to the application for a Special Exception. Jim Michal replied they had not yet filed or posted signs at the site.

Bob Hunnicutt stated he had provided a number of attachments to this application to inform the group that in addition to the controversy when AT&T considered a monopole in this vicinity, the renewal for the Special Exception for the nursery itself had also been very controversial.

Dave Niblock added that he knew that a neighbor to the property had vigorously opposed the Special Exception renewal for the nursery. He added that if the TTFCG supported a 153' monopole, when it went to the Board of Appeals they would see in the meeting minutes that the group had been interested in possibly reducing the height of the monopole, and the Board could decide the appropriate monopole height for the Special Exception.

Henri Edoh noted that the ground elevation for this site is somewhat lower than the property AT&T had planned to put its 130' monopole.

Regarding the nighttime light for the flag, Bill Landfair asked if there had just been one Special Exception where that had been a concern. Jim Michal stated that only the Norbeck area siting had been of concern, and Sprint had agreed to the trial period for lighting the flag in the Darnestown area. Mr. Landfair asked if Sprint planned to submit any photo simulations with this application. Mr. Michal replied that he didn't think that was necessary because the other monopoles of this design had been constructed and if the Board was interested in seeing how they looked, they could visit one of the sites to get a realistic view rather than a photo simulation.

Jane Lawton stated that she would prefer to have the monopole somewhat lower, and thought that it should also be designed in a "tree" stealth design.

Melanie Coffin agreed with Pat Hanehan's comment that there did not appear to be much difference in the visual impact if it was a 153' or 120' facility.

Motion: Melanie Coffin moved the application be recommended at the 153' height conditioned on approval of the Special Exception. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item – Electronic TTF CG Meetings: Jane Lawton asked if it was still acceptable to the group to use e-mail for voting on consent agenda applications when they were the only items to be considered by the group. All group members agreed it was acceptable.

Discussion Item – Use of County Land for Telecommunications Facilities: Jim Michal commended Pat Hanehan in his work with carriers to site on school property, and said he thought it would be in the County's interest for its real estate staff to become more involved with the carriers to identify County land for siting telecommunications facilities. He suggested that the TTF CG representative from the real estate division meet with the carriers to review the carriers' plans.

Jane Lawton replied that at the onset of the TTF CG process began, the land owning agencies adopted policies and created processes to expedite applications using public property for those purposes.

Dave Niblock stated that although Mr. Michal's idea sounded like a good one, the TTF CG representatives have many other responsibilities and probably would not have much time to meet with all of the carriers to review their plans.

Bob Hunnicutt reminded the group that as the Tower Coordinator, he often spends a great deal of time with carrier representatives and site acquisition contractors reviewing the tower database and potential site locations, whether on public or private property. He said he often refers carriers to agency representatives in cases where it appears public land would be a suitable site option. For example, he recently met with a Cingular representative to review locations for 9 proposed sites, and during that process they identified WSSC property and MCPS property as potential sites.

Jane Lawton agreed that Mr. Michal's suggestion could be explored and proposed they discuss it further with Steve Batterden at another time. Mr. Batterden commented that although he had just recently been appointed to the TTF CG, he had already spent a lot of time working with Sprint for siting towers on several County properties. Melanie Coffin suggested that to work as a group on this process would probably not be as productive as working individually with agency representatives.

Discussion item – Application Fee Update: Jane Lawton asked for a status update for the fee payment process. Margie Williams replied that carriers were paying the fees as required, but that many payments were being hand delivered, when mailing the payments would suffice.

Discussion Item – New TTF CG Member: Bill Landfair introduced Carlton Gilbert, the new County zoning supervisor, who would be replacing Michael Ma as the permanent TTF CG representative. He stated that Mr. Gilbert had previously been a tower industry consultant in Virginia. Mr. Gilbert added that he had also worked for the Arlington County zoning office.

The next meeting of the TTF CG is scheduled for Wednesday, November 12, 2003 at 2:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room #225 of the COB.